

VZCZCXYZ0008  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1235/01 3542018  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O 202018Z DEC 09  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1035  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/Joint STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 6094  
RHMFIS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFIS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE  
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFIS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 3273  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 2283  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7490

S E C R E T GENEVA 001235

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/19/2019

TAGS: KACT MARR PARM PREL RS US START

SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA  
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) DEFINITIONS WORKING GROUPS MEETING,  
DECEMBER 18, 2009

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States  
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-159.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: December 18, 2009  
Time: 3:30 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.  
Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

¶3. (S) The Definitions Working Group agreed to send two terms to the Conforming Group ("routine movement," "test heavy bomber,") and drop five terms ("deployment area," "restricted area," "nuclear armaments other than long-range nuclear ALCMs," "missile-defense system," and the already conformed term "training heavy bomber"). The Russian side reopened the term "category" and the sides agreed that about 15 terms remained for discussion during the next session.

¶4. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Sent to Conforming; Additional Discussions; and Agreed to Delete

-----  
SENT TO CONFORMING  
-----

¶5. (S) The following two terms were agreed and sent to conforming:

-- The term "routine movement" means the movement of a deployed mobile launcher of ICBMs for the purpose of training, maintenance, or testing that begins and ends at the same basing area and does not involve movement to any other declared facility except movement to the maintenance facility associated with that basing area.

-- The term "test heavy bomber" means a heavy bomber which is not a deployed heavy bomber, and whose sole purpose is testing.

-----  
ADDITIONAL DISCUSSIONS  
-----

¶6. (S) The U.S. side initiated discussion on "ICBM base" and "basing area" to introduce the area size limitations that reflected the current U.S. proposal in the bracketed Article VI. Adm. Kuznetsov deflected discussion until the next session saying this would be discussed in Moscow during the break. Kuznetsov offered as a personal aside that he believed that all areas should have a limit and that he had expressed such a view to the Russian delegation. He did not know if this view would hold in Moscow.

¶7. (S) Questions regarding the newly proposed version of "warhead" were raised by the U.S. side. Additionally, Dr. Fraley and Mr. Taylor reminded Kuznetsov that, when he had proposed the term, he suggested it might not need to be defined; and they asked whether he had further thoughts on this. Kuznetsov opined (at length) about the difference

between reality and virtual reality with respect to counting warheads and stated that questions which arise will need to be answered. He indicated the term "warhead" was used consistently when addressing ICBMs and SLBMs but that this was not the case for heavy bombers. For deployed heavy bombers, however, it was used one way for counting (attribution) but another way for inspections (where deployed heavy bombers were inspected to count the numbers of nuclear warheads on them.) He believed that a good way to cover both cases would be through the definition of "warhead." The U.S. agreed to take the information back for further internal discussion.

¶8. (S) U.S. questions about the definition of the term "variant" centered around how the current definition would help inspectors verify declarations and how it could be determined when it was an existing type versus a variant (once it was determined that it was not a new type). Mrs. Zdravecky described a scenario in which, during an inspection, if measurement of an item was different from the agreed dimensions for that type by less than three percent then the item would be confirmed as an item of the declared type. However, if it differed by more than three percent, such confirmation would not be possible. The inspection team would be uncertain as to what the item was, since it did not match the declared technical characteristics. Furthermore, if it did not differ by enough to qualify as a new type, its status would be even more difficult to determine. "What would it be?" Zdravecky pointed out that the definitions of variant and new type needed to take this into consideration. At this point, Taylor asked for confirmation that the tolerance for inspection measurements was three percent. Col Kamenskiy confirmed that it was. Kuznetsov and Kamenskiy agreed to consult their experts.

¶9. (S) Kuznetsov asked why the United States had not stayed with the START definition for "telemetric information." He proposed that the term should be "information that originates on board a missile during its flight test that is broadcast", and the phrase "or recorded for subsequent recovery" should be bracketed as U.S.-proposed text. The sides agreed to return to this during the next session.

-----  
AGREED TO DELETE

-----

¶10. (S) In closing, Kuznetsov reviewed the list of definitions that remained to be discussed. Addressing the definitions of "restricted area" and "deployment area" Kuznetsov opined that they could be deleted since the U.S. side had agreed the terms "basing area" and "ICBM base" would replace them once the definitions were worked out. Taylor offered that he could agree, with the understanding that the U.S. proposed adding the size limitation of 125,000 square kilometers for an "ICBM base" and a limit of five square kilometers for "basing area." The Russian side agreed to drop the term "nuclear armaments other than long-range nuclear ALCMs" and offered to drop "missile defense system," since the latter no longer appeared in the treaty documents. The Russian delegation raised the already conformed term of "training heavy bombers" because it, also, no longer was used in the treaty text. The sides agreed to delete the term.

About 15 terms remained to be discussed during the next session, out of the approximately 125 terms listed in the definition joint draft text JDT at the beginning of this negotiating session.

¶11. (U) Documents Provided:

- UNITED STATES:

-- U.S. Working Paper, "basing area," dated December 18, 2009, in English.

-- U.S. Working Paper, "ICBM base," dated December 18, 2009, in English.

¶12. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Taylor  
Dr. Dreicer  
Mr. Elliott  
Dr. Fraley  
Mrs. Zdravecky  
Ms. Gesse(Int)

RUSSIA

ADM Kuznetsov  
Ms. Fuzhenkova  
Col Kamenskiy  
Ms. Melikbekian  
Mr. Poznihir  
Mr. Pogodin (Int)

¶13. (U) Gottemoeller sends/  
GRIFFITHS